



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ENGLISH ETYMOLOGIES.

Principles of English Etymology, by the Rev. WALTER W. SKEAT, Litt.D. Second series. *The Foreign Element*. Clarendon Press, 1891. 8vo, pp. xxxi, 505.

It is very desirable that one or more good books should be available on the subjects treated in this volume. I say subjects because the field covered is so wide, and so much special knowledge is needed for a treatment like that here attempted, that one man may well feel himself incompetent to treat adequately all the phenomena. And if the writer, as in the present case, can lay little claim to the knowledge of a specialist in any of the subjects treated, then his highest aim must be to put in a clear and attractive form the accepted results reached by those scholars who stand in the foremost rank as investigators of the matters concerned. It is true that Professor Skeat is not altogether an outsider for some of the languages here treated, for he has, as the author of an 'English Etymological Dictionary,' almost inevitably been led to study somewhat the Anglo-French and the continental dialects of Old French, so that we may expect him to know and use some of the best books and articles published. His great industry and careful reading of modern philological works are again shown in this volume, and he has himself apologized in his preface for undertaking a task for which he does not claim to be fully qualified.

Perhaps the most obvious criticism that can be made upon this volume is that it attempts too much, and goes into details which it would have been better to omit in the interest of the reader, who would thus get a better and clearer idea of the most important principles, and also in the interest of the author who would thus have avoided some mistakes, or at least doubtful statements, he has made. Further, the material drawn from the work of other scholars has not been fully digested in the author's mind before his own statements were allowed to get into print. This appears from various inconsistencies and unfortunate arrangements of his matter, as well as an occasional infelicity of statement. In what is the most important part of the whole book, the treatment of the Old French element in Eng-

lish, it is greatly to be regretted that Skeat did not consistently take as his starting point the Old French pronunciation as it existed in France, and make this the basis of his treatment of the secondary Anglo-French and of the further history of the Old French words in English. This part of the work would thereby have gained greatly in clearness and might have been, at the same time, given in less space, while the gain in space might have been utilized for the presentation of some of the real or apparent exceptions, if it seemed worth while to mention them at all. The jumble of the *o*-sounds (*o* and *o*; cf. §§66, 70, 77, 87) would then have been avoided. Professor Skeat is well known to understand fully the distinction between sounds and letters, as appears, for example, from his chapters on English spelling and on phonetic spelling in the First Series, of his, 'Principles of English Etymology,' and in the present volume he has given considerable space to the pronunciation of Anglo-French. He probably exaggerated the difficulty of starting from the sounds and considering the letters only as more or less good signs for the sounds, for it would seem that the idea must have occurred to him. It is true we do not know exactly what the phonetic distinction was between *o* (*ò*) and *o* (*ô*) in France, nor what the exact value of Old French *u*=Latin *û* was, but we do know that these three different sounds existed, and developed differently, and their development in England has been in general subject to laws which can be clearly stated.

The author gives nearly two hundred and fifty pages (Chapters ii—xii) to French and its influence on English, as compared with less than two hundred to all other languages (including Latin, to words from which a chapter of somewhat over forty pages is given), while several pages are devoted to subjects not properly belonging in this book, or not specially appropriate in it. The preponderance given to French is of course fully justified. Pages 294-316 are given to Italian; 317-341, to Spanish; 342-349, to Portuguese; 350-371, to Greek, and 399-440 to all other languages (Slavonic, Persian, Sanskrit, Hindustani, Semitic, Finno-Tataric, various Asiatic languages, Polynesian, African, American). Chapter xviii (pp. 372-398) treats of prefixes and suffixes. Some

foreign elements in English, it must be remembered, were treated in the 'First Series,' as the words early taken from Latin, the foreign Teutonic words, and the Celtic words. The chapters devoted to French are: ii (pp. 3-22) the Introduction of French words; iii (pp. 23-43) Some Description of Anglo-French; iv (pp. 44-56) Specimens of Anglo-French; v (pp. 57-75) Effects of the English Accent; vi (pp. 76-125) Words of Anglo-French Origin: Examples; vii (pp. 126-136) On some changes in Pronunciation; viii (pp. 137-169) Words of Central French Origin; ix (pp. 170-181) Words of Late French Origin; x (pp. 182-204) French Words of Latin Origin.—The Vowels; xi (pp. 205-238) French Words of Latin Origin.—The Consonants; xii (pp. 239-248) French Words not of Latin Origin. These chapter-headings give some idea of the way in which the author has treated his subject, and I now proceed to some observations of detail, without discussing all the places I had marked, for this would carry me too far.

Page 11. "The old *w* . . . has disappeared in French, its place being supplied by *g*." Of course, *gu* (*g*) was Old French also, the *w* forms belonging to a different dialect. Also the *qu* in Old French was certainly not always pronounced as in Eng. *quit*.—P. 13. "Corpse (*ps* kept)." But the usual Old French form had no *p*, and the true English word representing Old French *cors* is *corse*, now poetical only, while the *p* in *corpse* is due to the etymological French spelling *corps*. The statement on p. 219 is better. To be sure the very oldest French does show *corps*. Why is the pronunciation of *ch* as *sh* in *chivalry* "detestable"? If usage sanctions it (cf. the 'New English Dict.' on *chevalier* and *chivalry*) it is correct, however much it may be opposed to an etymologist's views as to what is historically correct, and however irregular or historically wrong it may really be. It is our business, as linguistic students, to explain, if we can, the actual phenomena of language, but ought we to alter or try to alter the modern forms, even if we think we have a sufficient knowledge of the factors which have operated to produce them, simply because we think some of those factors ought not to have been allowed to exert any influence?—P. 21, §16. Can it

be that Skeat means that Chaucer considered Anglo-French to be as good as Parisian French? Does he think that anybody in England or anywhere else thought so in Chaucer's time? It is hardly necessary to say that the linguistic views here ascribed to Chaucer are more characteristic of the nineteenth century, in which, indeed, they are still far from being common to all persons of education, than of the fourteenth. Further, when on the next page we are told that the French of Paris had but lately risen into importance as a literary language the ordinary reader would hardly suspect that "but lately" is to be understood as meaning about two hundred years before. It might also be asked whether "the language of the English court under a king who claimed to be *also king of France*" was French of "the scole of Stratford atte Bowe."—P. 27. In connection with the statement here made about the work done for Anglo-French forms of English words thence derived, may be mentioned the notice of the 'Rough List' by Visions in the *Literaturblatt*, iv, 464.—P. 29. Laws of William I. The MS. is here ascribed to the thirteenth century, while on p. 44 it is said to be of the twelfth.—P. 30. To Behrens's earlier useful work may now be added his later treatment in Paul's 'Grundriss,' i, p. 799 ff., and Suchier's brief notice of this in the *Literaturblatt*, xii, 53. The table for Anglo-French pronunciation (pp. 37, 38) might be improved by omitting quantitative distinctions for the vowels, as so little is known of Old French and Anglo-French vowel quantities. For *e* and *o* the important thing to note is the difference in quality (*e*, *ɛ*, *o*, *ɔ*). Similarly *ui* should be distinguished from *ɥi* (*ui*), and this from *ɥi*, particularly where modern French is misleading, as for the word *oyster*, with which compare *usher*, *pew* (as pointing to *ui*). As to *ai* and *ei* the pronunciation was not always diphthongal; cf. the modern English and the varying early spellings, and the treatment of these diphthongs by Behrens. Anglo-Norman was by no means always spelt as it was pronounced, and for this problem we must keep in mind the older French pronunciation which was changing in not quite the same way in the dialects of France, while the influence of the French of France on that of England continued

more or less active, and Anglo-French was itself changing, and was exposed moreover to influences from English, and we must also remember that French words adopted into English were not all adopted or fully naturalized at the same time. Such considerations may help us to understand some of the exceptional or difficult cases mentioned by Behrens, for example, while we can see clearly the general correctness of the laws he gives. When the subject has been more studied we may see results not dissimilar to, but not agreeing entirely with those obtained by Förster for the dialect of Chrétien de Troyes. Skeat himself puts the matter better on p. 40. Is it well to speak of a diphthong *ea*? P. 41 puts it better. The form *oe* (pp. 38 and 42) should be put before *eo*, as being the original one, *eo* being a later variant in spelling after the sound became *e* (or, perhaps, while the sound was *ö*, if that was the intermediary stage). On p. 42 the sound of *eu* in Fr. *peuple* seems to be considered a diphthong ("and then [that is, after having taken the sound of French *eu*] it became a monophthong"). The pronunciation *æy* (*y=ü*) for *eu* it is indeed well to query; it would have been better to leave only the query (or to substitute *eu* for *æy*) and omit the references to Schwan, which can hardly do the reader any good. Several different things are here put together, with no proper regard to what the ground-forms for Anglo-French were in each case, and the cases of *eu* in Schwan's §285 are not mentioned at all. See also Neumann's review of Schwan in Gröber's *Zeitschrift*, xiv, and cf. Skeat's own §83.

Page 40. "A[nglo] F[rench] *sch* was originally pronounced as written, that is as *s* . . . followed by *ch* (in *charge*), but passed into *sh* (in *shall*); hence the M. E. symbol *sch* for the sound of *sh*." But cf. Eng. *peach*=O. Fr. *pesche*, also *cheat*, *chess*, *checker*, *chine*, by the side of *marshal*, and observe the note on p. 71 of this book, where not quite the same thing is said as here on p. 40. I need not repeat what I have already said on the English sound *ʃ* in words from the French (see MOD. LANG. NOTES, March, 1892, col. 154). The explanation for the M. E. spelling *au* before *n* + cons. suggested by Skeat (p. 41), that it was

caused by the originally nasal sound of the *a*, is far from being certain, Skeat himself says that vowel nasality was "probably soon lost in Anglo-French since English shows but slight traces of it." (What are the "slight traces" meant?) As Skeat says, generally speaking, the Old French nasal vowels do not seem to have left traces in English, and moreover this Anglo-French *au* for older *a* is late Anglo-French, not an early phenomenon. It is at least possible that it was due to some peculiar English influence, which caused the glide from *a* to the following *n* to take on a quality resembling or reaching *u*, and it is not impossible that this may have been caused by the peculiar resonance of the *n* in English pronunciation. The subsequent change of *au* to *a* would in that case be similar to the changes in the case of *chafe* (see Murray, s. v.), *save*, *sage* (the plant), *savage*. Moreover, in the word *jaundice* the *au* was certainly originally a diphthong in France and a true diphthong must once have existed in the case of such words as *laundry*, *laundress*, and probably of *saunter*. Yet these words have developed in Modern English in the same way as *haunt*, *daunt*, and as, in much at least of "standard English," *lance*, *dance*, *aunt*. The other result of the diphthong *au* is shown in the modern sound *ɔ* (as in *awe*), the common value assigned now to the spelling *au* or *aw*; as in *haughty*, *brawn*. It is perhaps worth adding that *laundry* has in Maine, or had there some twenty or thirty years ago, very frequently the value *laundri* with the diphthong *au*, instead of *landri*, and I may remind readers of the Teutonic change of old Aryan vocalic *n* to *un*. Another case of the old diphthong *au* giving *ɔ* is *falcon*, in which, however, the intrusive *l* is now sounded by some. With this view it is comparatively easy to understand the various forms given by Skeat in the other places where he touches on this subject (cf. §§49, 50, 51, 54, 82); except indeed that I have not attempted to explain why *au* has sometimes developed like old *a* and sometimes gives *ɔ*. On this point I have as yet only a suspicion, rather than a fully formed theory; it is not yet ripe for presentation.—P. 41. The *an* in *rank*, *standard*, etc., may be due to Continental influence, *en* and *an* being

in France to a great extent pronounced alike; see also Skeat's remark p. 129, §96, (2). The foot note on p. 126 is not a sufficient explanation; why should *e* in *renc* have had a nasal sound any more than, or one different from that of *e* in the words which gave us *amend*, *tent*, etc.? Cf. also *sample*, pp. 66, 78. In §58 (2), (pp. 85, 86) the matter is again mentioned; such repetitions with more or less variation are frequent and annoying. This fault is somewhat atoned for by the excellent index, in which I have noted only the omission of *use*, p. 47.—P. 41. The two important different sounds of *e* are here recognized, though the treatment is inadequate.—P. 42. In *ie* the *i* can, in general, be neglected for Anglo-French, the change of *ie* to *e* being one of the earliest of Anglo-French peculiarities. One often asks himself in reading, what period of Anglo-French is in the author's mind? The modern English spelling with *ie* is mentioned in §84. An interesting chapter might be written on Old French spellings as explaining present English spellings, and in connection with this might be discussed some cases of spelling influencing pronunciation. The *o* before *m* and *n* in Anglo-French we naturally suppose to have been *o* (*u* in England), as a general rule. The sound we give to *o* in *compass*, for example, is the regular and proper one for such cases; cf. the different pronunciations now given the *o* in *combat*. On p. 42 an explanation of the spelling with *o* instead of *u* is offered; for a discussion of the sounds as later developed, see §§65, 66, 67, 69, 72, 74, 77, 87, and, perhaps, other places. The general principles are perfectly simple, and could have been briefly stated and illustrated. But I have already drawn attention to the confused treatment of the *o* and *u* sounds.—P. 43, line 3, "*u* long by position" is a phrase that ought not to be used; it is the syllable, not its vowel, that is long even with the added foot note, the vowel itself being in such cases usually short, though it may be long in spite of position.—P. 59. Either here or somewhere else (for example, in chap. xi) the difference between the final consonants in *advice* (*s*) and *advise* (*z*); *use*, n., and *use*, v.; *strife* and *strive* might have been noticed and explained, and the cases of O. Fr. *-t* and *-d-*, for example, dis-

cussed for the words which English adopted. Perhaps this has been done somewhere in the book though I have not found the place; there is no doubt that the author understands the principle, see p. 194.—P. 60. The explanation given of the difference in accent between noun and verb (*conflict*, *convict*, *torment*, etc.) is interesting.—P. 64. Is it true that *schl* passed through *shl* (*ʃl*) on the way to *sl* in *sclandre*, *slander*? I think not.—P. 67. *Eschaete* (for older *-eite*) is an interesting case of survival in English, through a participial noun, of the O. Fr. p. p. in *-eit*=*-ēctum*.—P. 70. *Coevrir*. Better to write *covrir* or *cuvrir*, in the infinitive.—P. 81. Can the sound *a* (*aa*) in *pass* and similar words be properly called a retention of the Anglo-French sound? It is rather a comparatively late modern development from the sound *æ*, itself regularly descended from Anglo-French or Middle English *a*. Middle English long *a* regularly gives us not *a* (*aa*) but *ei* (*é*), and if *pass*, etc., did show a retention of the Anglo-French sound of *a* we should have a problem to solve.—P. 84 (§56). "It is weakened to short *i*." The "*it*" means the *e* in *el*, and not *el* itself, as the language used implies.—P. 91. The spelling *ie* for original *ue*, *oe* in *reprieve*, *retrieve* might have been mentioned here, as well as the *ie*=O. Fr. *ie*, which, as is here said, meant the close *e* sound. The reason is clear enough; namely, O. Fr. *ie* and O. Fr. *ue* both gave in English the same close *e* (*é*), and the traditional spelling *ie* was sometimes used for this sound, even when the O. Fr. original did not have *ie*. In §84 the author appears to understand what he here misses a clear reason for.—P. 101 (§67). Cases like *butcher* with old *u* preserved may be compared with native words like *full*. The labial consonant is doubtless in part at least the cause; cf. *put*, *bull*, etc. In §68, (2) the modern *fool* points to a Middle English *fol*, while the O. Fr. vowel was *o*. The change of quality may have been due to the labial *f* or to the *l*, or to both combined. The rarity of the sound *û* (in *fool*) in modern English words derived from O. Fr. is easily explained, and perhaps the explanation is in this book; one expects to see it here (§68 or in the vicinity) but it is missing, and cases like *move*, *prove*, which are here mentioned ought to have

been explained. In §85 (p. 117) we find something more, but no clear explanation is given there, either.—P. 102. The cases of regular development spoken of in §69 are really not those which have the sound *o* as in *common*, *admonish*, *honor*, etc., as might be inferred, but those mentioned in §67 with the sound heard in *money*, *comfort* (first *o*).—P. 103. In *enfourmer* the *ou* is regular enough as far as the quality (Continental French *o* not *ø*) is concerned, for the *o* was long in Latin, and is so given by Körting ('Lat.-roman. Wörterbuch').—P. 110. In *gule* the vowel was in French *ø*, not *ü*, and the word should accordingly have been put in another place, and the exceptional character of the development of English *gules* noticed.—P. 111, foot note 2. This should rather have been given as the regular mode of formation for words taken from the spoken language, and the statement of the rule might be better.—P. 113, (2). "In a few cases," it is here said, "both *ai* and *ei* have become" long *i* (as in *plea*, *treat*, etc.). There is nothing irregular about this treatment of original French diphthongal *ai* and *ei*, when they had become monophthongs in England in Middle English times, and the language used, which implies something irregular or exceptional, should have been different. Behrens has given a good statement of the laws followed, which explains why we have sometimes long *i* and sometimes *ei* (*ē*), as in *pay*, *vein*; see now Paul's 'Grundriss,' I, pp. 821-823, though it need not be assumed that there are no difficulties left.—P. 113. In *receipt* the *ei* is due to the influence of *receive*, or the French original of the latter word, for the O. Fr. form from which our noun came had *ē* and not (originally) the diphthong. Similar is the case of *deceit*. P. 117. The form *ulas* points rather to *utaves* with *ü* for *iii* than to the anomalous and, probably bad spelling, *oetaves*. The *ü=iii* shows the diphthong of the simple word *huil*. Instead of such a form as O. Fr. *retreuver*, should be given either the proper infin. *re-trover* or a form with the accent on the stem to show the diphthong *oe*, *ue*; for example, *retruevent*. So in other similar cases.—P. 119. For my own dialect *coit* is not a better spelling than *quoit*; is the pronunciation *koit* common in England, or anywhere in this country?—

§87. Only cases of a true diphthong *ou*, or at least of what was previously a diphthong *ou* should be mentioned; such as *ou* in *outrage*.—P. 120. The word *pui* was always a monosyllable in O. Fr. and would have given *pu* (with *ü*) in Anglo-French, whence English *few* might have regularly descended. But dissyllabic Middle English *fewe* points to O. Fr. *puie*, representing a plural *podia*, and this O. Fr. *puie* is in Godefroy. We are not obliged to assume so strange a thing as that O. Fr. *pui* gave a dissyllabic form *pü-i* in Anglo-French, and that this then gave a Middle English *fewe*.—P. 123. The wording "evidently because a silent initial *h* before a stressed syllable is opposed to the habits of the language" is queer. What is meant, is that the influence of spelling on pronunciation, here shown, would not have taken place if the vowel had not been accented. But the habits of our language are not at all opposed to an unaspirated accented vowel at the beginning of a word. The spelling of the language is here confused with the language itself.—P. 124. The *ž* sound in *measure* comes from *z+y*, the written *su* meaning formerly *zyu*, the *yu* being the regular descendant of Fr. *ü*. The author probably understands the matter, cf. §83, (3).—P. 125. Can the *s* in *viscount* ever have had the sound of *z*? It is difficult to believe it.—P. 127. The pronunciation marked for the Middle English form of *judge* has at least one misprint, *g* for *j*. The *u* may be intentional.—P. 128. The case of *room*, with its exceptional long *u*, is perhaps a secondary lengthening from *rum* (with *u* as in *bull*), a pronunciation known both in England and this country, and itself due, perhaps, to a previous shortening of the original long vowel, the sound *u* being then kept under the influence of the labial *m*.

The substance of Chap. vii can be indicated by saying that sounds of Anglo-French origin, the words once naturalized in English, developed regularly in the same way as the same sounds similarly situated in native words. It would be well to change or query some of the Anglo-French pronunciations given, and to revise the conclusions that follow the lists, but I have touched on some of the most important points already. I pass rapidly over Chapters viii and ix, with the interesting remarks on the

language of Chaucer, of Lydgate, of Caxton, of Shakespeare, and particularly of Dryden. Notice the misprint "phthysic" (p. 154).—P. 158. *Gimmel* (-*bif*) is, I believe, marked in at least one dictionary as pronounced with *g*, as in *get*; this seems to be a modern mistake.—P. 166. "*Ritornella*, as in Italian." I know only *ritornello*.—P. 173. The letter *a* in French represents two well-recognized sounds, not one only.—P. 178. The Eng. suffix *-oon* cannot be a survival of the Anglo-French form of the O. Fr. suffix *-on*; for that, if the accent had remained on the last syllable, would have given words rhyming now, as in Middle English, with *town*. The last sentence in the paragraph is unwarranted.—P. 181. To speak of the loss of a mute *l* is odd.

Chapters x, xi, xii deal with the history of French phonology. There is here far too much detail, the really essential phenomena and the most important laws not being made properly prominent. It is unfortunate that Schwan's assumption of a Gallic Low Latin sound *œ* for classic Latin *au* has been followed.—P. 193. The paragraph numbered eight, shows a lack of acquaintance with phonetics, and it is a lack which is lamentably common.—Pp. 199–204. Only the regular changes for popular words should have been given, and, for example, *e* for Latin "free tonic" *ē*, *ae* should have been omitted.—P. 212. What is said of *genteel* is not exact. It is here said that the "Middle English *gentil* has split into distinct forms, according to the accent; viz., *gentle* and *genteel*. The latter is valuable as showing a survival of the old pronunciation of E[ng]. *ī*." A previous mention of *genteel* occurs on p. 175, in the chapter on words from modern French. The inconsistency is obvious, and the incorrectness of the statement on p. 212 equally so.—P. 229 refers to "*L* with *y*, p. 230" for *lenteil*, but no explanation is there given.—P. 231. Unintelligible is the remark about the Normans as having no difficulty in pronouncing Lat *w* (*uiperam*), when we reflect that this Latin *w* had long before become *v*, so that there was no Lat. *uipera* in existence. Was there in this case influence of a Teutonic form early borrowed from Latin and so having initial *w*?—P. 240. Schwan's remarks are on the phonology of Greek loan-words in Folk-

Latin, not in French. This should be noted lest Skeat's remark that "the Greek here spoken of is the late or Byzantine Greek, rather than that of the classical period," be understood as meaning that these words are of comparatively modern origin. Some of the words are certainly pretty old. Schwan well says that these Greek words entered Folk-Latin "zu sehr verschiedenen zeiten."—P. 284. O. Fr. *norice* is not regularly formed for the descendant of Lat. *nutricem*; see the reference given by Körting for an explanation of the real source of the O. Fr. word. This example occurs in the chapter on words of Latin origin, after the French element has been disposed of.—P. 304. It would have been better to omit the *ī* for Italian, and also the line following.—P. 305. The example *justo* is not good, in that it implies that *justo* is a recognized and not uncommon Italian word, for no others ought to be used as examples. Better would be *pajo* (also spelt *paio*), or the whole line might be omitted. *Cielo* is not pronounced with a close *e*.—P. 307. The spelling *c(i)* in *judc(i)are*, *manc(i)are* is clumsy, and not very clear. Cf. on these words Körting, 'Lat. roman. Lex.,' *manduco*, with the forms and references there given.—P. 309. In *florin* (English) is not the *l* due to a Low Latin form, or to knowledge of the etymology? It would be better to omit the remark, as it implies that *florin* is Italian, or at least that the Italian word has *fl*. There are several words in this chapter which suggest queries, but I pass them by with the general remark that for Italian, as for French, there is too much detail, and only really plain and clear principles should have been given and illustrated.

In the chapter on Spanish it would have been best to follow Knapp on pronunciation, instead of mixing Knapp's statements with those of P. Foerster when they are in contradiction, as in the "exceptional case" (which as such and as looking very improbable even to a tyro, should have been omitted) of the pronunciation of *escena* with *s* as Eng. *z* and *c* as Eng. *th* (in *that*), and also as in the immediately preceding remark about *z* (p. 332). Araujo's first article on Spanish pronunciation in the *Phonetische Studien* was probably unknown to Skeat when this book was publish-

ed.—P. 320. *Savanna* is not from the Greek through Lat. and Span. (cf. pp. 337, 341 for Skeat's whole view), cf. the accent of the Span. word and its meaning, see Littré., s. v. *savane* (in the *Supplément*) where, however, a correction for reference to the edition of Las Casas, 'Historia de las Indias,' now in print, Madrid, 1875-76, is called for; it is in Book 1, chap. 91 or vol. ii, p. 35 that the passage occurs: "al pié del asiento de esta fortaleza está un llano gracioso, que los indios llaman çabana." I may also mention as of possible value in this connection an article in the New York *Nation*, 1885, vol. xl, p. 508. There is a Span. *sabana*, accented on the second syllable, which does correspond to our word, and is this *çabana* in modern spelling. *Paragon* (same page) is spoken of as from Span., while on p. 335 we see that Tobler's etymology is known to Skeat, and is spoken of as the probable solution. It should have been added, therefore, that Tobler does not derive Span. *paragon*, *parangon* immediately from Greek, but thinks the word was brought from Italy into Spain. Skeat's quotation from Minsheu (1623) does not prove that our word came immediately from Span.; it may have come from French which also had the word in the sixteenth century; it was in use in English before 1623.—P. 321. Interesting are the remarks on *garble* with the correction of Godefroy. I have already mentioned some statements about Span. pronunciation; there are also inconsistencies; cf. what is said of the sounds of *z* and *c*, p. 323, §226 (*z* pronounced as *s* is apparently considered the Spanish pronunciation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries), p. 333 ("ç=ts?" and the remarks on Eng. *lasso*), and p. 436, where we read: "but it seems clear that in the sixteenth century, Span. *ç* and *z* both had the sound of *z* in *zone*." And in the same sentence, further on, is added: "that *ll* had the modern Italian, not the modern Spanish sound; and that *x* had the old sound of E[ng]. *x* in *mix*, though it, probably, soon passed into *sh*." The idea of different dialect developments of older *ç* and *z* might naturally have suggested itself to explain cases like *lasso*, but no such idea seems to have occurred to the author. No comment is needed on the last words quoted.

There is much that is good in this book, and the main cause for regret is that more time was not given to its preparation, so as to make it, as it might have been made, very much better. As it is, it at least contains a large number of examples, and will show the great importance of the French element in our language, and future writers on that subject will be likely to utilize much of its material, while it may be doubted whether they will have such a knowledge of Middle English as Skeat.

I have never studied any work from his hand without profit, and if in the present case the profit has been less than I had hoped, the reason is that the work was done in a field where he is not quite at home.

E. S. SHELDON.

Harvard University.

OLD ENGLISH LITERATURE.

Ethical Teachings in Old English Literature. By THEODORE W. HUNT, Ph.D., Litt. D., Professor of English in the College of New Jersey. Funk & Wagnall's Company, New York: 1892, 8vo, 384 pp.

THE aim of Dr. Hunt's book is to counteract the chilling and repressive influence of the dominant, materialistic philosophy, as speculative and unethical, upon the poetic instincts. "If English literature comes more and more into union with modern materialism its doom is sealed." He finds "the precedent of the present tendency in the period when English Deism was at its height and the speculative reason usurped the place of simple faith."

There is no abstract discussion of the relation of morality to literature, but in the course of his historic review he shows, as they arise, that the best literary products of the English mind are ethical. The dependence of literature upon its moral contents and spirit for its power, dignity, and æsthetic value is assumed. Dewey is quoted: "no poetry can be good, even in an æsthetic sense, which is divorced from the moral principle."

He seeks to counteract the enfeebling influence of the materialistic philosophy upon English literature in particular, by showing that the constitutional bias of the mind of the English race received from *the ethical teachings*